D618
C.532
V.26

The Divinity School News

THE DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Vol. XXVI AUGUST 1, 1959 No. 3

Published quarterly by the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, 5801 Ellis Ave., February 1, May 1, August 1, and November 1. Entered as second-class matter, March 20, 1934, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of February 28, 1925, authorized April 18, 1934.

[The following sermon was preached in Joseph Bond Chapel on April 29, 1959, by Edward W. Warner. Mr. Warner is a student in the Divinity School studying toward the Ph.D. degree in the field of Religion and Art.—EDITOR.]

THE HERESY OF JOY

The joy of the Lord is your strength.—NEH. 8:10.
But we had to celebrate and show our joy.—LUKE 15:32.

THERE is a heresy in the land. Let the orthodox beware and tremble, for in the castle of despair someone is singing in the dungeon. Whose voice is that? And what is the song? And whatever are we going to do about it?

We, the orthodox, have to be careful. For our orthodoxy is a good orthodoxy. It has been inevitable, thrust upon us, permeated with the sting of reality. We have not come to the recognition of brokenness by any other way than that of hard living. We have affirmed the categories of the demonic and of sin not because we wanted to but because we had to. We proclaim estrangement; we search the tragic vision; we pronounce pathos because they have told us, and tell us, who we are and what life is. We go on the way we do about despair just because despair is appropriate. The bomb we threw while playing in the dark has not yet reached the ground—but it really may. Berlin is the focus of trouble now; and, if we get past that, there will be something else to get past after that. We are sorry, but we just cannot forget the wars and the shaking of the foundations and the rattling of the windows—we do not dare. We have to be careful.

And, yet, there goes that music again, someone "singing in his chains like the sea." Who can it be? What? Is it one of us, the orthodox? How is it possible? It sounds positively joyful!

How come this joy "kick" anyway? Strangely enough, it appears on the scene as something thrust upon us, permeated with inevitable reality. I speak of it now unavoidably because my friends in orthodoxy (who are experts in matters of despair), my own troubled existence, this Christianity business that I cannot seem to unload, and the persistently stark modern literature

all present me with a similar phenomenon. The phenomenon is illustrated by this incident. A dear, crazy-mixed-up friend in one of his wilder moments in the process of psychoanalysis was in a great storm of anguish; his face was contorted, his body tense, and he was going on at great length in very angry tones, only to be startled by the analyst's response: "You're faking; all this time you have had your glasses in your hand, holding them very gently, calmly, securely."

Now, I am not intending at all to say that our hard-won orthodoxy is fraudulent. But, look, there is that heretical hand! Listen, there is that off-beat music. It is positively joyful! And it can be heard in the stark modern literature, and in my friends who are experts in despair, and in my own troubled self, and in this Christianity business I cannot seem to unload. In fact, it is one of the reasons why I cannot unload any of these items—or resist them more successfully—or would not if I could. What is this heresy at loose in the land? Having already made a gesture of appropriate apology for using this term, I am unabashedly going to call it "joy." In theological terms it is "the joy of the Lord." And the proposition before us is: It is not only in the judgment of God or the mercy of God or the being of God that we are to find what we are and need but that, when all is said and done, it is "the joy of the Lord that is our strength."

What is joy? Here are what seem to me to be some of the elements or ways of speaking of joy. The first is *celebration.* "Go your way, eat the fat and drink sweet wine and send portions to him for whom nothing is prepared; for this day is holy to our Lord; and do not be grieved, for the joy of the Lord is your strength."

To celebrate is to frequent, to keep an appointment of meaning, to proclaim, to sound the praises of a person, an event, an idea. One way to ask for the meaning of a person is to ask, "What is he celebrating?" The television program "Captain Kangeroo" is justly famous for many reasons, one of which is that stirring cartoon, "Tom Terrific." This stunning piece comes on with the knockout opening line: "Terrific! The real great adventures of me!" Once we begin to shake off the un-Christian "Christian inhibition" that somehow nothing exciting is ever supposed to happen to us, we can see that everyone does have his story, his "real great adventures of me." There are, after all, some people who know how to celebrate their adventures, while others just rub against themselves, other people, and life. The celebrators one can hardly help loving; they have the wisdom and the courage to let gestures, occasions, persons—for all else that they are—be something in themselves.

The play *Harvey* by Mary Chase is the story of the gentle, eccentric, alcoholic Elwood P. Dowd, who has as his friend and companion an enormous white rabbit. Unseen for the most part by anyone except Uncle Elwood, Harvey has wondrous consoling powers which finally conquer everybody's resistance. Dr. Chumley, the psychiatrist who is out to cure Elwood and rid the family of the disconcerting presence of Harvey, has a spectacular conversion: "Fly-specks. I've been spending my life among fly-specks while miracles have been leaning on lamp-posts on 18th and Fairfax." And then in a magnificent aside, he blurts out in a frenzy: "To hell with decency! I've got to have that rabbit!"

What is it with that rabbit? I had known for some time that I was hopelessly charmed by Harvey, but I was never certain as to just why until one day the "breakthrough" occurred. (This incident is certainly eccentric but, I insist, non-alcoholic!) I was standing at the Illinois Central Railroad station at Fifty-third Street, waiting for a train Downtown. It was between five and six o'clock in the evening so that most of the traffic was southbound out of the Loop. I looked up to see two trains on parallel tracks racing toward the platform. Being a frequent traveler on the I.C., I responded to this sight as an unusual coincidence. As the trains approached, I, of course, expected one of them to stop for passengers and the other to go sweeping by. But I was startled, amazed, and utterly delighted to see them *both* go blazing past, neck and neck at full speed, all the way down the tracks and out of sight. It was breathtaking! My immediate response was to exclaim, "Holy Toledo! Look at that!" But then I was confronted with a problem: To whom was I going to make such a comment? I knew no one else on the platform; one man sort of looked like he was going to let loose with appropriate response—and did not. And then I understood Harvey. Harvey is there to help keep that impulse to celebrate alive. All you do is turn, look up at that glorious character, and let go with full enthusiasm: "By golly! Did you see that?" And, of course, he did. Harvey does not miss a thing worth celebrating! He helps keep alive a heretical joy that lets gestures, occasions, persons—for all else that they are—be something in themselves.

A second way of speaking of joy is *irrepressibility,* the uninhibitable response to something which has happened. Children at play still produce wisdom to make adults sit up and take notice. During baby-sitting duty one day, the wild young things I was somehow supposed to manage were reaching new heights of chaos, all over a new toy. I attempted to cut into this holocaust with a highly distraught, "Cut it out!" only to be dropped in my tracks by this reply: "We can't stop now. We just found the way to play with it!" That bit

of "live grace" belongs in the category of "the never to be forgotten," not only because of what they said, but also *that* they said it *then.*

The guarded anonymity of city living is sometimes broken by refreshing exceptions to the rule. A young man and a young woman were walking toward each other with all the determined disinterest that characterizes Chicago sidewalk traffic. Suddenly, just as they were about to pass, they threw their arms around each other in sweeping embrace, talked excitedly—for no more than a minute—and then went on their separate ways as casually as they had come together. While "hugging clubs" are undoubtedly not the complete answer to life's complex difficulties, let us not miss the point: Whoever those two were, they had the power to celebrate each other on the spot, to be swept into mutual affirmation without embarrassment; they plainly "enjoyed" each other in a moment without fear or hesitation.

J. B. Phillips' translation of the Prodigal Son story gives the full impact of the father's "justification by joy" as his exuberance overflows at the test of his older son's bitterness: "My son, you have been with me all the time and everything I have is yours. But we *had* to celebrate and show our joy. For this is your brother; I thought he was dead—and he's alive. I thought he was lost—and he's found!" Can't you see? Heretical as it may be, we *had* to celebrate and show our joy!

The third element in joy is its *conquering* power. The strange miracle of the persistently stark modern literature is that through its thorough explication of trouble and ruin shines a relentless strength. This strength is not only the exhilaration that fierce honesty is but also the affirmative power for which fierce honesty prepares a relevant way. William Faulkner, in receiving the Nobel Prize, declared: "I believe that man will not merely endure—he will prevail." Albert Camus added unto his own message: "In the midst of winter I finally discovered in myself an invincible summer." This kind of "being positively joyful" one might have to call "living without hope" in order to express at all—but let us not miss that singing in the dungeon. It is a heresy that belongs.

Handel's oratorio *Israel in Egypt* celebrates first the mighty acts of God in the Exodus and then the mighty attributes of God. Whatever reluctance in yielding to this story is engendered in us by questions historical and philosophical, the sheer magnitude of affirmation in this music is overwhelming. In the final chorus a solo voice fires the phrase: "Sing ye to the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously." And the chorus explodes in response: "The Lord shall reign for ever and ever." The solo voice: "The horse and his rider he has thrown into the sea." The chorus: "The

Lord shall reign for ever and ever." One simply cannot avoid the message: The Lord triumphed *gloriously*. This was no split decision—he knocked him into the sea!

Such singing tells that, as sin, brokenness, and estrangement are always present, always lurking, sometimes they get conquered. The locating and cataloguing of disease in psychotherapy is impossible without the idea and power of health. We may not always be able to tell exactly what happens, but, even if we just keep going until whatever the trouble is gets conquered by whatever it is that conquers this sort of thing, still victory of some sort is the issue. The concept of suffering love persists not only by its relevance to brokenness but also by its conquering power in and through brokenness.

The fourth element in joy is *fulfilment*. Paul Tillich has said that "joy is the expression of our essential and central fulfilment." So we ask, "Is fulfilment really possible?" And over and over again we answer: "No, no, no—but, yes!" If we use the concept that "man is made in the image of God," how shall we understand this image apart from understanding God as creative and as rejoicing in his creation? Does not, then, the creature made in the *image* of God enjoy a capacity for rejoicing in response to the joy of the Lord?

Leonard Bernstein captured the imagination of many persons with his television series on the various forms and powers of music. One of the broadcasts concluded with an explication of Beethoven's *Ninth Symphony*. How really incredible it was to hear a man in the mid-twentieth century talk excitedly about "all kinds of joy." Then came the performance of the last movement of the symphony. And there they were—all those people, all those sweating human animals, stretching and struggling in enormous effort to bring forth ecstacy—not overexcitement, but ecstacy! Here was great nakedness, an absolute fragileness—and great power, the force of fulfilment. As the massive climax banged out to the end, the insistent question "Why?" received its answer. In the joy of men at the joy of life, "the joy of the Lord" there shimmers and shines through. And it is strong—as only the ultimate can be strong.

The joy of the Lord is our strength. When we know its fulfilling, conquering, irrepressible celebration, we can—even in great brokenness—say "Yes" to life, to others, to ourselves, because there is nothing else to say and nothing else we want to say. We can even say "Yes" to God with the good idea, "Yes" to the Christ with the joy to be completed in men, "Yes" to the Spirit that will not let us forget.

So let us go our way to eat and drink and send a portion to him for whom nothing is prepared; let us make a great rejoicing, because we have understood the words that were declared to us—the joy of the Lord is your strength. And when the orthodox ask us what we are doing—when we the orthodox ask ourselves what we are doing—let us answer faithfully: "There's a heresy at loose in the land, and we're celebrating. What we thought was dead is alive. What we thought was lost is found. Can't you see? We *have* to celebrate and show our joy!"

EDWARD W. WARNER

FROM THE DEAN'S DESK

Evidence continues to accumulate that the churches in America are seriously concerned about the quality and significance of theological education and debate. Most of the Protestant groups are increasing their financial support for the theological schools to which they are related. The North American Conference on Faith and Order held at Oberlin in 1957, the intensive theological work done in connection with the merger of the Congregational Christian and Evangelical and Reformed Churches, and more recently the second national Theological Conference held by the American Baptist Convention at Green Lake, Wisconsin, are examples of the theological ferment within the life of the American churches. The Confession of Faith produced by the Congregational Christian and Evangelical and Reformed Churches is one of the notable theological documents of our day, in my judgment.

It is difficult to know the extent to which the various study commissions of the World Council of Churches have contributed to this significant growth in theological interest and literacy. My view is that these study groups have been of very great significance indeed. Some of us have spent many hours and made many long trips throughout the world in order to have a part in such ecumenical theological work. Just now I am preparing for a second trip to Europe this year to attend Faith and Order consultations. The most encouraging fact in this revival of the discipline of theology is that it is not by any means the work of professional theologians alone. The lay theologian is once again assuming a vital role in theological discussions and debates throughout the world. May the number and quality of such lay theologians increase!

Student enrolment for the Autumn Quarter, 1959, at the Divinity School will be considerably higher in the D.B. category, it appears. Thus far, 18 students have been accepted for admission for this degree, with 12 students in the M.A. and 38 in the Ph.D. programs. Scholarship assistance for students in the Ph.D. program is now more adequately available as a result of two new foundation grants. The Sealantic Fund provides for about 40 awards nationally on a competitive basis. For 1959, 5 F.T.F. students have received Sealantic awards. The Lilly Endowment has provided grants to several institutions for the same purpose during the past year and has renewed the grants for the coming year. The F.T.F. has received a grant of $15,000 for each of these two years. The importance of such nation-wide awards for graduate theological study is enormous. Students in our Ph.D. programs seldom find it possible to complete their studies without having to carry heavy outside responsibilities to cover their financial costs. Those students who are holders of these new fellowships will be able to give at least one year of full attention to their academic programs.

Attention is called elsewhere to the 1959 Theological Conference of the Roger Williams Fellowship to be held on November 3–5. The program as announced appears to be quite definite, in-

cluding the designation of lecturers. Mention might also be made here of the forthcoming Haskell Lectures for 1959 to be held on the University campus. Professor Kurt Aland, a distinguished church historian and New Testament scholar now teaching at the University of Münster, will lecture on "Conversion in the History of Christianity." The public is welcome to attend these lectures, and alumni are particularly encouraged to be present. Time is the second and third weeks of December. Exact dates will be announced later.

The faculty has approved a new program of study leading to the M.A. degree in Religious Education. The period of study will normally cover about three academic years. Our hope is that in time we will be enabled, through this new program, to meet the urgent demands for church leadership in religious education. As many of you know, we receive letters almost daily asking for help in filling vacancies in this field—and we have little help to give. A detailed announcement describing this new program will be forthcoming soon.

The national Theological Conference sponsored by the American Baptist Convention was referred to above. This conference was, in my judgment, an event of great significance for the church in America. Careful preparation had been made in advance, including the writing of historical and theological papers on "Baptist Concepts of the Church"—the theme of the conference. Small seminar sessions occupied the major part of the time of the 140 participants. At the conclusion of the week, a Message to the Churches was drafted and discussed for hours. This Message is now being revised and will be sent to the churches of the American Baptist Convention, if acceptable to two-thirds of the conference representatives. I know of no single thing undertaken by the Baptists during the last decade of equal significance with this theological study which has been carried through under the guidance of Dr. Lynn Leavenworth of the Board of Education and Publication.

CONVOCATION

At the Spring Convocation on June 12, 1959, under the Federated Theological Faculty, the following degrees were conferred:

I. BACHELOR OF DIVINITY

In co-operation with the Chicago Theological Seminary

EZEKIEL BELL
S.B., Tennessee State University, 1956
Under Generalized B.D. Program

JOSEPH WALTER CARROLL
Thesis: "John Williamson Nevin's Protest against Revivalism: The Occasion and Substance of His Protest"

LEE ALLEN DALRYMPLE
A.B. North Central College, 1955
Thesis: "Karl Barth's Doctrine of Election and Its Problem of Apokatastasis"

ROBERT FRANCIS DOWREY
S.B., Tufts College, 1952
Under Generalized B.D. Program

PHILIP MYRUM DRIPPS
A.B., Hamline University, 1956
Under Generalized B.D. Program

JAMES DEHAVEN HAKES
A.B., Grinnell College, 1953
Thesis: "The Word *Life* in St. Paul"

RONALD DALE HUTCHINSON
A.B., Wayne University, 1955
Under Generalized B.D. Program

FRANK CHRISTIAN ISAACS
A.B., Oberlin College, 1956
Thesis: "The Development, Use, and Exegesis of the Hymns of Isaac Watts, Charles Wesley, and John Mason Neale"

LEON JOHNSON
A.B., Dillard University, 1956
Under Generalized B.D. Program

PATRICIA KELLY JONES
A.B., Pennsylvania State University, 1954
Under Generalized B.D. Program

PAUL LOUIS KITTLAUS
A.B., University of Missouri, 1956
Thesis: "The Ministry of the Great Conversation with Adolescents"

RONALD EDWARD KRAEHENBUEHL
A.B., Heidelberg College, 1956
Under Generalized B.D. Program

TOM J. LASSWELL
A.B., San Diego State College, 1956
Thesis: "Training Church-School Teachers To Teach the Biblical Paradigm of Bondage and Freedom"

HUBERT GAYLORD LOCKE
A.B., Wayne University, 1955
Thesis: "The Christology of Peter: A Study of the Concept of Jesus' Death and Resurrection in the Sermons of Peter in Acts"

NED HOWARD MARTIN
A.B., College of Wooster, 1955
Under Generalized B.D. Program

JOHN HARRISON PETER III
A.B., Dartmouth College, 1956
Thesis: "The Concept of Evil in the Works of Nicolas Berdyaev"

CHARLES MORTON SPENCE
Under Generalized B.D. Program

DONALD GENE STONER
S.B., Ball State Teachers College, 1956
Under Generalized B.D. Program

LYMAN HARVEY THOMPSON
A.B., Eastern Michigan College, 1956
Under Generalized B.D. Program

DONALD BUTLER WARD
S.B., Northwestern University, 1942
Thesis: "Douglas Horton, Congregationalism, and the Church"

PEGGY BRAINARD WAY
A.B., University of Michigan, 1954
S.W.M., Wayne University, 1956
Under Generalized B.D. Program

WILLIAM F. WAY
A.B., Kalamazoo College, 1954
S.W.M. Wayne University, 1956
Under Generalized B.D. Program

DONALD ROBERT WHITE
A.B., Berea College, 1956
Thesis: "An Examination of the Development of Karl Barth as Indicated in the Epistle to the Romans and *Church Dogmatics*, I, 1"

GEORGE THOMAS WRIGHT
S.B., Elmhurst College, 1952
Ed.M., University of Illinois, 1955
Thesis: "The Drug Addict and the Christian Fellowship"

In co-operation with the Disciples Divinity House

DON SPENCER BROWNING
A.B., Central College, Fayette, Missouri, 1956
Thesis: "Critical Defense of the Solution to the Problem of Faith and Reason in the Writings of Paul Tillich"

EDWARD HENRY KOLBE
A.B., University of Houston, 1956
Under Generalized B.D. Program

In the Divinity School

ALAN BRAUER ANDERSON
A.B., Knox College, 1956
Under Generalized B.D. Program

CHRISTOPHER HSIN-REN CHOW
Th.B., Nanking Theological Seminary, China, 1947
R.E.M., *ibid.*, 1948
A.M., Hartford Theological Seminary, 1950
Th.M., Central Baptist Theological Seminary, 1951
Thesis: "A Metaphysical Inquiry into the Ultimate Incomprehensibility of Tao"

JOHN NORMAN GREGG
A.B., Shimer College, 1953
Thesis: "Karl Barth's Doctrine of the Resurrection"

EN-TSE LAI
A.B., Taiwan Teachers College, Taipeh, Taiwan, 1952
Under Generalized B.D. Program

JOHN RUDOLPH NIEMAN
Thesis: "The Dynamics of Growth in the Teacher-Class Relationship"

ROBERT PAUL TAYLOR
A.B., Denison University, 1956
A.M., University of Chicago, 1959
Under Generalized B.D. Program

In co-operation with the Meadville Theological School

JAMES HARRY CURTIS
A.B., University of Chicago, 1951
Thesis: "Rainer Maria Rilke's Poetry of Incarnation"

ALLAN WAYNE DAMPMAN
A.B., Harvard University, 1949
Under Generalized B.D. Program

NEAL WARD FERRIS
Mus.B., University of Texas, 1956
Thesis: "Linguistic Analysis and Theological Language"

WILLIAM RICHARD JACOBSEN
A.B., Concordia Theological Seminary, 1955
Under Generalized B.D. Program

GEORGE ROBERT REED
A.B., Lafayette College, 1950
Thesis: "Religious Humanism and the Philosophy of Whitehead"

REX JOSEPH STYZENS
A.B., Shimer College, 1954
Under Generalized B.D. Program

GRETA MARIE WORSTELL
A.B., Ohio Wesleyan University, 1951
LL.B., Harvard University Law School, 1954
Thesis: "Lamennais' Concept of the Church"

II. MASTER OF ARTS

In the Divinity School

ROLAND CHRISTENSEN DOWELL
A.B., Ottawa University, Canada, 1954
D.B., Andover-Newton Theological School, 1957
Three papers

BARBARA GRAYMONT
A.B., The University of Maryland, 1948
D.B., Howard University, 1951
Thesis: "The Churches and Repeal: 1928–33"

NORMAN FRANCIS GUSTAVESON
A.B., Drake University, 1952
D.B., University of Chicago, 1956
Thesis: "The Contribution of Ernest Cassirer's *An Essay on Man* toward an Interpretation of Man's 'Mental Activity' and Its Subsequent Implications for Illuminating the Problem of Knowledge"

KENNETH LEE JANZEN
A.B., Redlands University, 1952
Three papers

ALEXANDER WILLIAM KENWORTHY
Th.L., Baptist College of Victoria, Australia, 1952
D.B., *ibid.*, 1954
Thesis: "The Quaker Principle of Inner Light: Its Significance for Christian Education Theory"

SANG HEE MOON
Th.B., Chosun Christian University, Seoul, Korea, 1950
S.T.M., Union Theological Seminary, 1956
Three papers

ERNEST FRED NOLTE
A.B., Elmhurst College, 1931
D.B., Eden Seminary, 1934
Three papers

KORAH PHILIPOS
A.B., College of Science, Trivandrum, India, 1933
Thesis: "A Study of the Concept of Christian Mission in the Orthodox Churches of Malabar"

JOHN WILLARD STETTNER
A.B., Ohio State University, 1947
D.B., Yale University, 1950
Thesis: "A Proposal To Make the Theory and Practice of Premarital Counseling Consistent with Modern Theory and Practice of Pastoral Counseling"

ROBERT PAUL TAYLOR
A.B., Denison University, 1956
Thesis: "The Relation of a Constructive Christian Theological Position to the Writing of Prose Fiction"

RUTH JOAN WATSON
Thesis: "The Internal Dynamics of Teachers of Junior-Age Children in Baptist Churches"

HERBERT CHRISTIAN WOLF
A.B., Johns Hopkins University, 1943
D.B., Capital University, 1947
Thesis: "Revelation in Brunner and Tillich"

III. DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In the Divinity School

ERIC THOMAS DEAN
A.B., University of Chicago, 1950
D.B., *ibid.*, 1953
Thesis: "Calvin and Barth on Scripture and Tradition"

JAMES GORDON EMERSON, JR.
A.B., Stanford University, 1946
D.B., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1949
Thesis: "The Remarriage of Divorced Persons in the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.: A Constructive Proposal Based on Presbyterian Church History, Presbyterian Church Law, and Pastoral Premarriage Counseling of Divorced Persons"

EVERETT LAWRENCE PERRY
A.B., University of Rochester, 1938
D.B., Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, 1941
Thesis: "The Role of Socioeconomic Factors in the Rise and Development of American Fundamentalism"

DAVID CHIEN-SENG YU
LL.B., Soochow University, China, 1941
D.B., Nanking Theological Seminary, China, 1944
Thesis: "A Comparative Study of the Metaphysics of Chu Hsi and A. N. Whitehead"

WALTER HARRELSON
Dean

THE STUDENT-FACULTY SPRING CONFERENCE

Although Dean Brauer decided once again not to dismiss classes on the grounds that this would be a much too obvious and official way of encouraging both faculty and students to attend and in spite of the disheartening fact that very few members of the faculty were disposed to be with us at all faithfully, the annual student-faculty conference held on May 12 and 13 this year actually turned out to be one of the best we have had of late. To be sure, nothing quite so dramatic or historic as the encounter between Mr. Loomer and Mr. Barth, which made the conference held two years ago so memorable, took place. Nor were as many of the local and still very trying academic policy issues brought out in the open, as was so characteristic of last year's conference, where the very good, but by no means simple or easy-to-answer, question as to whether we are or are not in the process of making some rather basic changes in our general philosophy of theological education was, however obliquely and inconclusively, discussed. Nevertheless, it was my feeling that this year's conference was exciting in a no less unique and unforgettable way.

What was most distinctive and so impressive about the conference this year is to be found in the fact that we were assigned the rather strenuous but—I think—extremely important task of trying to answer a very ancient and highly philosophical question about theology in a characteristically modern way. The question was, "Is Theological Discourse Adequate?" And the way suggested was the method or approach of linguistic analysis. As John Chandler, president of the Divinity School Student Association, was quick to observe in the brief but rather pointed remarks he made by way of introducing the theme of the conference to us, this particular topic had been chosen without any anti-Lutheran malice of forethought and yet quite deliberately in order to force students and faculty

alike to come to terms with a significant development in contemporary British philosophy and theology. This observation struck me as being very acute, since I think it is all too true that most of us have tended to confine our attention to American or Continental movements and figures. Most of us, for example, may have read fairly widely and intensively in Whitehead, Wieman, Hartshorne, Niebuhr, Tillich, Barth, Brunner, and Bultmann by now. But I doubt very much whether many of us had taken a really close and careful look at *New Essays in Philosophical Theology* or *Metaphysical Beliefs* until this conference provoked at least some of us into doing so. These are two volumes of essays recently published in England under the general editorship of Alasdair MacIntyre and Ronald Gregor Smith. Both represent a fresh, disarming, and quite promising attempt to use the methods of linguistic analysis in an effort to clarify certain basic theological problems and religious issues.

Of course, it took a lot more than a classic question put in a bluntly modern but still rather grand way to make this conference as good as it was. The stature of the faculty members whose arms had been twisted into writing papers and the quality of the students who had been persuaded to risk serving as their critics were the things that really counted in the end. The faculty papers were given by Professor Vere C. Chappell, a bright young linguistic philosopher who recently became a member of the University's Department of Philosophy where the principal task he has set for himself is the long-overdue one of trying to develop a much broader, more various, flexible, and non-reductive kind of semantic analysis than was characteristic of the original logical positivists; Professor Joseph Sittler, who continues to make a deeper and deeper impression upon the theological ethos of this place in and through his chosen role as "systematic theologian" in the older but (to his way of thinking, at least) by no means outdated conception of that task; and Professor John Hayward, who is beginning to find his true home and his real voice in the theological field as an assistant professor of philosophical theology, with a special concern for the way the concept of myth has figured so prominently in recent discussions between and among philosophers, theologians, and critics of literature and the arts. The student critiques were made by Robert Hershberger (Theology), Neal Ferris (Theology), and Maynard Kaufman (Religion and Art). Indeed, by virtue of the fact that the papers, the critiques, and the discussion occasioned by them were unusually solid this year, I have had no real choice but to keep this report fairly long on descriptive summary and a bit short on interpretative or evaluative commentary.

Mr. Chappell's paper started us off on the right foot, since he confined himself very strictly to the general question at issue and the particular method or approach proposed. He began by insisting that the question as to whether theological language (or any language used in a theological way) is adequate was to his mind an essentially philosophical question rather than a theological question, much less a religious one. It is a philosophical question because it confronts us with the essentially philosophical task of

trying to determine the precise nature, purpose, or intent, the characteristic methods and procedures, and the most appropriate norms, models, and tests for evaluating the claims of theology as a special intellectual discipline, both in its own terms and in relation to the very different aims, methods, and standards which may be characteristic of certain other major but no less special disciplines like philosophy itself, the various sciences, and art. It is not a theological question because it is a question *about* theology, not a question *in* theology. Still less is it a religious question, since we can be very concerned to ask and answer it even if we do not happen to be committed to any concrete body of religious convictions and beliefs or any particular set of religious rites and practices ourselves. At the same time, Mr. Chappell was sufficiently candid to admit that the reason he was coming down so hard on this first point was not simply that he considered it to be true or that he was convinced that it should be as decisive for us as theologians as it is crucial for him as a philosopher but because his own lack of knowledge about theology and the severe limitations of his acquaintance with religion made it impossible for him to deal with the question in any less general way. He also confessed that a concern to be respectful toward us, conjoined with this sense of his own ignorance, made him doubly anxious to avoid the necessity, or even the possibility, of having to pick a quarrel with us about the adequacy of any particular theological doctrines or religious practices in a substantive way. Having stressed the essentially philosophical nature of the question at issue and the equally philosophical character of the point of view from which he intended to talk about it, he went on to suggest that one of the most distinctively modern approaches to philosophy (i.e., linguistic analysis) has provided us with a very clear method or way of putting questions of this kind and an extremely powerful set of procedures and techniques for going about the very difficult but by no means hopeless business of finding valid, appropriate, and convincing answers to them. For example, instead of encouraging us to ask or answer the question as to whether theological language is adequate in the abstract, this approach suggests that we begin by taking a close look at particular theological statements which classical or modern theologians have made in order to find out precisely what sort of thing it is that statements of this kind are apparently intended to say, be, and do. This is important because we cannot hope to test their adequacy or inadequacy in an appropriate way unless we first have a rather clear grasp of what this particular kind of statement is meant to accomplish or effect. Indeed, the concept of adequacy itself has no meaning in relation to any kind of statement until we know what that kind of statement is meant to be adequate about, with, for, and to. Similarly, instead of encouraging us to assume that theological statements have the same function as certain other kinds of statement do, this approach suggests that we take another and still more careful look at particular theological statements in order to discover whether they really achieve what other kinds of state-

ment do. This is no less important, since a theological statement may be quite valid and adequate if it succeeds in doing what it is possible and fitting for a certain kind of statement to do but quite inadequate if it is claimed to do what it is much more appropriate and far more possible for some other kind of statement to accomplish. In this connection, he drew our attention to three very different kinds of statement which have been identified by this approach: cognitive statements which try to make assertions and give information; expressive or poetic statements which attempt to evoke certain feelings or attitudes; and rhetorical statements which seek to commend some way of life, mode of action, or kind of belief. At the same time, Mr. Chappell was very concerned to have us recognize that the particular version of linguistic analysis he was suggesting to us is much broader, more flexible, and less reductive than the kind undertaken by the original logical positivists who were either not interested in theological statements at all or considered them to be meaningless, since they do not happen to behave in the way good scientific statements do. In closing, he hazarded the guess that most theological statements do not intend to make assertions in a strict cognitive sense and do not succeed in giving us information in the usual way. Unfortunately, he lacked time to develop this final point at all fully. But he did say that the reason why he could not assign cognitive status to theological statements is that they do not appear to be falsifiable. That is to say, he had been unable to discover under what conditions theologians would be willing to abandon them. He also implied rather strongly that he considered theological statements to belong to one of the other two categories he had described. In other words, he seemed to be suggesting that theological statements are more akin to poetry or rhetoric than they are to philosophy or science.

In his critique, Robert Hershberger confessed that he was troubled by the fact that Mr. Chappell had defined theology in two very different ways and was quite confident that only the first of these definitions would be at all acceptable to theologians. This criticism struck me as being very shrewd, since Mr. Chappell had started out by defining theology in terms of its subject matter or object (God and those aspects of man and the world which may tell us something about God) but had gradually shifted to defining theology in terms of its more specifically human purposes and effects. Mr. Hershberger also predicted that very few theologians would be willing to go along with his suggestion that theological statements are not intended to make assertions in a strict sense and do not succeed in giving us information in the usual way. This turned out to be a no less accurate prediction insofar as the theologians present were concerned, since neither Mr. Sittler nor Mr. Hayward would acknowledge that he was not trying to make cognitive statements in some sense or way. Indeed, even Mr. Chappell himself was forced to abandon, or at least qualify, his suggestion by agreeing that theological statements may indeed be cognitive in some special way and in some special sense. Moreover, in the course of the discussion, it became

no less clear that Mr. Chappell's final and more positive suggestion to the effect that theological statements may be more akin to poetry or rhetoric than they are to philosophical or scientific prose was not very satisfying to many of us either.

Mr. Sittler began his paper by admitting that he had a few less doubts about the adequacy of traditional theological language than he had about the adequacy of an essentially modern and therefore purely linguistic approach to philosophy, theology, or any other subject or discipline. After making this initial effort to stand the question of the conference on its head, he went on to present a brilliant exposition of his view that theological language is most distinctively evocative or expressive rather than propositional or persuasive in nature and a no less sparkling defense of his notion that theologians should therefore think twice before they decide to give up what is so rich and opulent about traditional theological language in favor of some more characteristically modern kind of language which aims at and thereby achieves a too simple, flat, and barren kind of clarity. As if this were not enough, he startled and amazed us even more by defining and illustrating what he considered to be the seven major canons of evocative-theological discourse: centrality, amplitude, capacity to transmit the historic faith of a particular religious tradition, propositional logicality, devotional evocativeness, meditational depth, and celebrative majesty. In so doing, he managed somehow to exhibit that he was more than capable of beating Mr. Chappell and the rest of us at the big or little semantic game we were trying to play. Turning to what he considered to be the much more substantive and important question as to what it is that makes a specifically Christian use of language adequate, he insisted that it is the purpose of Christian theological discourse to remind us of the historic fact of the Christian community, to transmit the faith of this community in and through the use of its own special language as we find it used in the Bible and certain classical Christian theologians, and to keep this language centered upon its unique object, that is, Jesus Christ as the decisive revelation of God's redemptive activity. Conversely, he claimed that Christian language becomes inadequate when it ignores the basic fact of this community, when it dissipates the faith of this community by using some language other than its own, or when it disengages this language from its center in Jesus Christ. In closing, he confessed that the language of the Bible and classical theology had had a liberating and civilizing rather than a narrowing and confining effect upon him personally. He also drew our attention to the fact that taking his views seriously would require our faculty to be much more obedient to tradition as well as to novelty than may have been characteristic of it in the past, would involve placing certain traditional disciplines like Bible, Church History, and theology into a more central and dominant position in our curriculum than they at present enjoy, and would force students and faculty alike to make the rather painful but extremely healthy recognition that we continue to suffer from an almost patho-

logical concern for what is contemporary, novel, and emergent in these parts.

In his critique Neal Ferris acknowledged that a Christian theologian who is as committed to using the traditional language of the Bible and certain classical theologians as exclusively as Mr. Sittler had confessed and demonstrated himself to be might be able to communicate quite effectively as long as he stayed within the relatively narrow and increasingly limited and limiting context of the church. But he questioned whether so exclusive a commitment to the use of this language could provide him with any very powerful or meaningful point of contact with philosophers, poets, scientists, or just ordinary people, including some deeply religious people, for whom this language has little or no meaning unless a genuine and serious effort to relate it to certain other very different, but by no means absolutely different, kinds of language or ways of using language has been made. He also wondered how Mr. Sittler proposed to go about making himself heard, or even overheard, among those for whom this language has never had, and perhaps never will or can have, as much meaning as it has for him. He was thinking, of course, of those who are committed to some other religious tradition in as total and radical a way as Mr. Sittler would seem to be to his. In the discussion that followed, Mr. Sittler's highly confessional manner of speaking was placed under considerable pressure from still another and—I think—even more important standpoint: The question was raised as to whether so blunt and violent a use of traditionally Christian language may not continue to bring Christians into bloody conflict between, among, and within themselves unless a strenuous effort is made to recognize that there have been not just one but several more or less equally valid Christian kinds of language or adequate ways of using Christian language. At the same time and in all fairness to Mr. Sittler, it must be said that his two most general and more formal points about the essentially evocative or expressive character of theological language and the importance of placing richness above, or at least on the same level with, clarity as its deepest aim were apparently so well taken that they enjoyed the happier fate of being placed under practically no pressure at all.

Mr. Hayward's paper on the recent theological controversy about myth was somewhat narrower in scope than Mr. Sittler's and a bit less directly related to the theme of the conference than Mr. Chappell's. But it impressed me as being the most carefully prepared and passionately delivered of the three. His central thesis was that myth is the most adequate mode of theological discourse because language used in an essentially imaginative way can penetrate deeper into experience and reality than language used in more strictly logical or narrowly factual ways. Indeed, he even went so far as to claim that it is precisely such a mythical use of language that makes the Bible as true and revealing as it in fact is. It was for this reason that he took such a dim view of the disparaging attitude toward myth which he considers to have been characteristic of both orthodox and liberal theologians in recent years. In his view, both positions assume

that what is true in or about the Bible is not myth, albeit for very different reasons. Whereas the orthodox theologians deplore myth because they assume that myth is not true and that the Bible of course is, the liberal theologians reject myth because they assume that what is true in or about the Bible is most certainly not myth. At the same time, Mr. Hayward was careful to qualify his thesis in two fairly radical ways. First, he acknowledged that no mode of theological discourse has been or can be entirely adequate or sufficient, not even myth. Second, he recognized that the religious meaning and power of great myths is not simply to be found in what they reveal or disclose but also and perhaps even more significantly in what they hide or conceal. It was for both of these reasons that he expressed agreement with Tillich's insight that what is most true in and revealing about biblical myths is to be found in the fact that they are "broken" myths. That is to say, they point beyond themselves and remind us of their own inadequacy in some decisive way. But these two qualifications did not prevent Mr. Hayward from sticking to his original thesis to the effect that we have no real choice but to rejoice in the mythical basis of our faith, since the consequences of failing to take myth this seriously in recent years have involved us in either unbelief or idolatry.

In his critique, Maynard Kaufman confessed that he was at once attracted and repelled by the very high view of myth which Mr. Hayward was trying to commend to us. He was attracted because he was disposed himself to take a similarly high view of what poetry is and does, since great poetry also transforms, changes, distorts, and heightens the objective events and literal meanings with which it begins and yet seems to be true precisely because of this fact of transformation and not simply in spite of it. At the same time, he was repelled because this view appears to claim that myth and poetry have some special access to experience, or even beyond experience to reality, which are denied to more pedestrian disciplines like history and philosophy when they confine themselves to what the more ordinary processes of empirical observation and reflective analysis can give us. Still more seriously, he questioned whether myth is what makes the Bible true, since biblical language attempts primarily to record and transmit the memory of certain decisive events which actually happened. In other words, the adequacy of the Bible would seem to reside in these events rather than in the mythical forms in and through which it attempts to record and transmit them. Most seriously of all, he doubted whether Mr. Hayward's two qualifications had managed to rescue him from making the fatal mistake of identifying myth itself with faith and revelation as if mythical forms rather than the crucial events in and through which God acted and continues to act can save us. In light of the radical quality of Mr. Hayward's thesis, the rigor and gravity of Mr. Kaufman's critique, and the fact that the discussion provoked by them seemed to generate more heat than light, I think it is fair to say that the concept of myth continues to be not just a point of contact but also a point of collision between us.

It was my special task to put some unasked or as yet unanswered questions to the three faculty leaders in order to provide a basis for the panel discussion at our final session together. Since these questions seemed to bring us to something more enlightening than just the bitter end, I shall repeat them here very briefly. First, it seemed to me that none of the papers had attempted to deal with the very important question as to whether there may not be some conditions or requirements which all kinds of language and all ways of using language must fulfil in order to be adequate. That is to say, all the papers seemed to be assuming that it is much more important to show that different kinds of language and different ways of using language become adequate in very different senses and for very different reasons than it is to exhibit that all kinds of language and all ways of using language also become adequate in the same senses, in the same ways, and for the same reasons. I was thinking, for example, of the proposal which Mr. Loomer made a number of years ago to the effect that our theological faculty should commit itself to the rational-empirical method, since this would seem to be the only method around which is capable of enabling us to become and remain faithful to the great fact that truth is one. However misguided this proposal may have seemed to many of us at the time or may continue to strike most of us here and now, I think it represented a truly heroic effort to answer a very important question. Indeed, the price we may have to keep on paying for settling for anything less than something very much like this is more split personalities, not to speak of a still more terrifyingly broken world. Second, it seemed to me that the question as to what is most distinctively theological about theological language had been left pretty much hanging in the air in spite of the fact that all three papers had expressed answers to it. Although Mr. Chappell had suggested that theological language does not have to be cognitive in the strict sense or in the usual way in order to be adequate, neither Mr. Sittler nor Mr. Hayward had been willing to recognize that they were not trying to make cognitive statements in some sense or in some way. Moreover, even Mr. Chappell was willing to abandon or qualify this suggestion when it turned out to be so unacceptable. On the other hand, Mr. Sittler's suggestion that theological language is most characteristically evocative or expressive rather than propositional or persuasive in nature and Mr. Hayward's insistence that only a mythical or highly imaginative kind of language can be adequate theologically would seem to be very much alike and quite close to one of Mr. Chappell's remarks to the effect that theological statements may be more akin to poetry than to scientific prose. However, neither Mr. Sittler nor Mr. Hayward seemed to find this suggestion to be very palatable when it had been made by Mr. Chappell rather than by themselves. I was also struck by the fact that none of the papers seemed to have taken Mr. Chappell's third possibility at all seriously. In this view, theological statements would be like rhetorical commands, summoning and calling us to commit ourselves to a certain way of life, kind of decision, or

quality of belief in a total and radical way. To be sure, Mr. Sittler came very close to doing this when he quoted approvingly one of Kierkegaard's many statements to the effect that religious language attempts to trap us into becoming the truth or being in the truth rather than just knowing or contemplating it. But he did not follow the point up or nail it down. This was a pity, since I think that this is the road we may have to take if and when we really do have to move in just one direction rather than in two or three or more. Third, it was my impression that the question as to whether there has been or can be such a thing as a uniquely Christian kind or way of using language had been answered in a no less distressingly vague and inconclusive way. To be sure, both Mr. Sittler and Mr. Hayward had affirmed that the Christian faith has its own special kind of language and its own peculiar way of using it. But Mr. Sittler seemed to be making it so special and unique as to leave us pretty much in the dark when it comes to explaining and accounting for the fact that it continues to be quite helpful when we are using it to open a few windows on the world rather than just checking to make sure that all the other doors have been slammed shut. Moreover, Mr. Hayward came very close at one point to confessing that he had not been able to find anything particularly unique about Christian language except in the subjective sense that it had somehow come to mean a great deal, and something rather special, to him personally.

Just a few more general and less critical words by way of a conclusion. For those of you who may continue to feel that this place sold out to Neo-Orthodoxy a few years back or has been taken over by the Lutherans still more recently, what was said and done at this conference should be just a wee bit reassuring. The very fact that we had been asked in all seriousness to consider whether theological language is adequate may remind some of you of the way Mr. Wieman used to express rather serious doubts as to whether *traditional* theological language is still adequate or ever was sufficient. The fact that a bright young linguistic philosopher had been invited to give the first paper and was encouraged to figure so prominently throughout our discussions may also bring back memories of the good old days when it was said that Mr. Hartshorne was addicted in an "ungetoverable" way to calling up Mr. Carnap at the crack of dawn or in the dark of night to find out whether his most recently revised and expanded version of the ontological argument was any more valid. On the other hand, the fact that one of the most solid papers was given by Mr. Sittler, who, along with Mr. Barth and a few others, has come to suffer *and* enjoy the fate of being turned into a symbol of the very different kind of doctrinal wind that is now blowing in and out of Chicago, should enable you to make the no less sane recognition that not all these recent shifts in the wind are quite as sinister or ominous as you may have imagined. At the same time, the fact that so very few members of the faculty were able or willing to be present may be as distressing to you as it most certainly was to me. But the fact

that an impressively large and able group of students were there has provided me with a final and much more hopeful note to strike—namely, if what happened at this conference is to be taken as a symbol of anything, it should be taken to point to the fact that it is not the Neo-Orthodox or the Lutherans or the administration or the faculty but the *students* who are in the process of taking over at Chicago. In any event, it is they who would appear to be remaining most faithful to what many of us still consider to be the original and most distinctive genius of this place, that is, the vision of a theological faculty and a student body who are concerned to engage themselves in nothing less strenuous or less rewarding than what our late Mr. Wach used to call the "rough and tumble" of genuinely theological talk and authentically religious encounters. If this is what is really happening, so be it and more power to them, I say!

PRESTON ROBERTS
Associate Professor of Theology and Literature

ROGER WILLIAMS FELLOWSHIP CONFERENCE
November 3–5, 1959

RELIGION AND WORLD REVOLUTION

The aim of the Roger Williams Fellowship Conference for this year is to examine the religious situation, especially among the living world religions and the so-called "primitive" religions, and to see what this situation suggests about the condition of man today, his fears, hopes, values, and the world pictures which hold his life together.

This examination is to be set into the context of Christian faith and life and is to be appraised from this general orientation. The planning committee appeared to be primarily concerned with the question of the bearing of national and cultural aspirations upon the fundamental meaning of life and the relation between the revolutional spirit of the age and the religious values and sanctions which are either affirmed and applied or ignored in this revolutionary ferment.

On the basis of these recommendations the following program has tentatively been planned:

First Day: "Religion as the Key to the Understanding of Culture: The Problem of Religions Posed"
A.M. "The Sacred and Reality"—MIRCEA ELIADE
P.M. "The Divine and the Demonic"—CHARLES LONG
EVE. Panel Discussion—ELIADE and LONG

Second Day: "The Religious Depths of Problems of Cultural Change"
A.M. "Israel and Judaism"—J. COERT RYLAARSDAM
P.M. "Religion and Nationalism in Southeast Asia"—JOSEPH KITAGAWA
EVE. Panel Discussion—RYLAARSDAM and KITAGAWA

Third Day: "Theological Dimensions of Cultural Understanding"
A.M. "Western Christianity and World Revolution"—BERNARD MELAND
P.M. "Religions and the Doctrine of the Spirit"—WALTER HARRELSON

FACULTY NEWS

APPOINTMENTS

LEROY HENRY ADEN was appointed Instructor in the Field of Religion and Personality in the Federated Theological Faculty as of July 1, 1959. Mr. Aden is a graduate of Wartburg College (A.B., 1951) and of Wartburg Theological Seminary (B.D., 1954). He is a native midwesterner from Iowa and began his studies under the Federated Theological Faculty in the autumn of 1954. He received the Master of Arts degree in the Field of Religion and Personality in 1956 and passed his Field Examinations for the Ph.D. degree in the Autumn Quarter, 1958. He is married, twenty-nine years of age, and his denominational affiliation is American Lutheran. Mr. Aden is recommended as a worthy successor to Mr. Arthur L. Foster, Instructor for the past year. Mr. Aden's appointment is also in keeping with the policy to find outstanding young men to serve at the Instructor level.

TRACY STRONG will join the Federated Theological Faculty as Visiting Professor of Missions and a member of the staff of the Center for the Study of the Christian World Mission for the academic year 1959–60. Born at Mount Vernon, Ohio, August 6, 1887, Mr. Strong spent his boyhood years at Oak Park, Illinois, and graduated from the high school there. He took his A.B. at Oberlin College in 1908 and studied for a semester at Union Theological Seminary. His alma mater conferred the LL.D. degree on him in 1943. Mr. Strong has given a lifetime of service to the YMCA. He served in Seattle from 1908 to 1923. Then he joined the staff of the World's Alliance of YMCA's and was stationed in Geneva, Switzerland, for thirty-five years. He began as boys' work secretary. During the war he directed the Alliance's War Prisoners Aid and for his service was decorated by the governments of France, Belgium, Poland, and Germany. Mr. Strong was the general secretary of the world organization from 1937 to 1953, when he reached the retirement age. The Alliance then made him its consultant, so as to continue to avail itself of his wisdom and knowledge.

Since retirement from official status, Mr. Strong has kept busy with new studies and adventures. During 1953 and 1954 he collaborated with Professor Clarence P. Shedd on the volume *History of the World Alliance of YMCA's*. Then Dr. and Mrs. Strong spent most of two years visiting every country of Africa south of the Sahara excepting Nyasaland, making a study of Christian services to African youth. After one term in 1957 as visiting professor at Morehouse College in Atlanta, the Strongs began their travels again. He was secretary of a special Committee for the Beirut Conference on Arab Refugees from Palestine. Then the Strongs spent the year 1958 visiting the Islamic countries and making an investigation of youth in the Islamic world.

Through his thirty-five years in Geneva, Mr. Strong was personally involved in the developing Ecumenical Movement and attended the various world

assemblies and conferences of the World Council of Churches, International Missionary Council, the Life and Work Movement, the World Student Christian Federation, and the World YMCA.

Mr. Strong will offer one course each quarter; counsel with overseas students, missionaries, and missionary candidates; and participate in conferences to be held by the Center.

JOHN SELDON WHALE has been invited by the Federated Theological Faculty to serve as Visiting Professor of Church History during the Autumn Quarter, 1959. Professor Whale is a distinguished English Congregationalist scholar who is retired from the Cambridge University faculty. He will teach the Common Core in Church History and will offer one advance elective course. A frequent visitor to the United States since 1934, Professor Whale has also served as professor of ecclesiastical history at Mansfield College, Oxford, as president of Cheshunt College, Cambridge, and as headmaster of the Mill Hill School, London. He received the M.A. degree from both Oxford and Cambridge and the Doctor of Divinity degree from Glasgow University.

PROMOTIONS

JERALD C. BRAUER, Dean of the Federated Theological Faculty, has been promoted to the rank of full Professor of Church History, and JAROSLAV J. PELIKAN has been promoted to full Professor of Historical Theology. Professor Pelikan is the recent recipient of the 1958 Abingdon Award for his book *The Riddle of Roman Catholicism,* which will be published in September, 1959.

OTHER FACULTY NEWS

W. B. BLAKEMORE, Associate Professor of Practical Theology and Dean of the Disciples Divinity House, will conduct the Sunday-morning services in Rockefeller Memorial Chapel during the Summer Quarter. Mr. Blakemore preached the sermon at the Chapel on July 5. In May he delivered sermons at the First Christian Church of Maywood, Illinois, and at the North Side Christian Church in Chicago. He also led a discussion on baptism in the Orchard Street Christian Church in Blue Island, Illinois. Recently, he spoke to a Southern Illinois laymen's meeting in the Christian Church of Albion, Illinois, and on July 7 he appeared on the University of Chicago's television program, "All Things Considered" to discuss the topic: "Should Women Minister?"

BRYAN DE KRETSER, Visiting Associate Professor of Missions, will be the keynote speaker at the World Presbyterian Alliance Conference to be held in São Paulo, Brazil, from July 27 to August 6. The theme of this centennial meeting is "The Servant Lord and His Servant People."

ROBERT M. GRANT, Professor of New Testament, has received a Guggenheim Fellowship for research in early Christian literature. In the words of Dr. Grant: "The Guggenheim Fellowship I received is for work in the summer and autumn of 1959 in England, the Netherlands, and here on early Christian Literature, specifically on the ways in which it was transmitted and used theologically from the time it was written until now. In other words, what I am con-

cerned with is early Christian tradition and traditions just after New Testament times. What has the authority of this material been in history of the church? What is this authority based on? And, ultimately, what is the relation between Scripture and tradition as authorities?" Dr. Grant and his family sailed from Montreal on June 18. They will live in Sussex, England, for three months. Dr. Grant will stay on alone through the Autumn Quarter to complete his research.

SEWARD HILTNER, Professor of Pastoral Theology, will return home this summer via southern Europe, where he will do some lecturing to ministers and theological students. Dr. Hiltner has been traveling on a Fulbright Scholarship to lecture on the minister's role in counseling and mental health. Fields of religion and personality as such are unknown in the theological schools of New Zealand. Psychiatric training for medical doctors can be had only by going abroad, and this is an expense most students cannot meet. Dr. Hiltner writes of this situation. "From the outsider's point of view, it is obvious that the government must subsidize overseas training. The fact that they now do so for veterinarians but not psychiatrists suggests not only the importance of farming in New Zealand economy but also that the problem is not just a financial one. In a New Zealand mental hospital, what it seems to boil down to is decent, humane care and no treatment except chemical and shock." Dr. Hiltner will be back in residence for the Autumn Quarter. His new book, completed abroad, will be published soon.

JOSEPH M. KITAGAWA, Assistant Professor of History of Religions, has returned from a year's tour in Asia. He spent eight months in Japan, engaged in research on Buddhism and other religions, and also participated in the Ninth Congress of the History of Religions. While in Japan, he served as visiting professor in the Department of Buddhology, Koyasan University, and gave lectures at Tokyo, Taisho, Nihon, Rikkyo, and Waseda universities in Tokyo, Kyoto and Doshisha universities in Kyoto, Kyushu University in Fukuoka, and Tohoku University in Sendai. After leaving Japan, he lectured at the Study Center of Chinese Religions, Hong Kong, Union Theological Seminary, Manilam International Institute of Advanced Buddhist Studies, Burma, and Marburg University, Germany. He contributed articles on "Nihonjin no Shukyo-sei" ("Patterns of Japanese Religions"), *Vision* (Summer, 1958), "Kyokai, Shakai, Shingaku" ("Church, Society, and Theology"), *Vision* (Autumn, 1958), "Sanka Gaijin Gakusha" ("Report on Western Scholarship at the History of Religions Congress"), *Gakujutsu Geppo* (October, 1958), "Beikoku ni okeru Shukyo no Gaku" ("Studies of Religions in America"), *Zaike Bukkyo* (January, 1959), and "Doctrinal Developments in Buddhism," *Quarterly of Study Center on Chinese Religions* (Hong Kong) (March, 1959).

W. B. J. MARTIN, Visiting Professor of Homiletics, had the honorary Doctor of Divinity degree conferred upon him at the commencement of the Chicago Theological Seminary on June 11. Mr. Mar-

tin has recently delivered the following lectures: "Modern Poetry and the Preacher" at the University of Western Ontario, London, Canada, and "The Minister as Interpreter" at the Princeton School of Religion.

JOHN W. MONTGOMERY, Librarian of Swift Library and Instructor in Theological Bibliography, attended the second annual Conference on Seventeenth-Century Lutheranism, held at Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary, Maywood, Illinois, on June 12–13. Also in June, Mr. Montgomery attended the thirteenth annual Conference of the American Theological Library Association, held at Knox College, University of Toronto, Canada. He has recently written an article entitled "The Colonial Parish Library of Wilhelm Christoph Berkenmeyer" published in the *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America,* second quarter, 1959.

NATHAN A. SCOTT, JR., Associate Professor of Theology and Literature, has contributed an essay to the volume *Symbolism in Religion and Literature,* to be published this autumn; two articles to *Weltkirchenlexikon,* a handbook of ecumenical theology; and an essay on "The Collaboration of Vision in the Poetic Act" in the volume of English Institute essays, *Literature and Belief.* Appearing in the summer issue of the *Chicago Review* is Professor Scott's essay, "The Broken Center: A Definition of the Crisis of Values in Modern Literature."

GRANGER WESTBERG, Associate Professor of Religion and Health, conducted a one-day seminar in Flint, Michigan, with Dr. Aldrich, head of the Department of Psychiatry, on Wednesday, May 6. Also in May he was guest lecturer at Carleton College and spoke several times on the subject of "Religion and Psychiatry." He lectured to a ministers' conference at Estes Park, Colorado; to the senior class of the Northwestern Medical School; and to the clergy and lawyers of Kokomo, Indiana, another of the interprofessional sessions which are part of the Lilly-Kokomo Project. To an audience of seventy-five clergy and seventy physicians, Mr. Westberg delivered the second in a series of four lectures in Rockford, Illinois, at the Rockford Memorial Hospital. On June 1 he gave the Commencement Address at Drake University on the subject, "The Wholistic Approach to Man." Recently, he was guest lecturer at Lankenau Hospital in Philadelphia in a three-day seminar celebrating the seventy-fifth anniversary of the relationship of the Lutheran Deaconesses to Lankenau Hospital and conducted the summer Workshop on Pastoral Care, sponsored by the Federated Theological Faculty, from June 22 through July 3.

Volume II, No. 5, of "Studies in the Lectionary Text of the Greek New Testament," edited by ALLEN P. WIKGREN, Associate Professor of New Testament Language and Literature, was published at the University Press in March.

ALUMNI NEWS

JOHN R. BEAN (B.D. '54) is now serving as associate secretary of the Ohio Christian Missionary Society, with special duties in the field of Christian education, and as editor of the *Ohio Work*, the Church of Christ's paper in the state of Ohio.

L. EMMA BRODBECK ('24–'32), a missionary under the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society, retired April 1, 1959, as directress of the Filamer Christian Institute in the Philippines.

DR. RICHARD E. SHEARER, president of Alderson-Broaddus College, Philippi, West Virginia, has announced the appointment of ELLIOTT D. BRYANT (B.D. '57) as assistant to the president, with responsibility for public relations and development. Mr. Bryant assumed his new duties July 1.

HARRY M. BUCK, JR. (Ph.D. '54) has received a grant-in-aid from the Third East-West Philosophers' Conference. Held once every ten years, the conference is an occasion for exchange in thinking between the two parts of the world and aims especially to remove Eastern philosophy from the realm of the occult. Scholars from India, China, Japan, Great Britain, and the United States have been invited to attend the meeting, to take place on the campus of the University of Hawaii, in Honolulu, from June 22 to July 31. Mr. Buck is the author of *The Johannine Lessons in the Greek Gospel Lectionary*, published last year by the University of Chicago Press in its series, "Studies in the Lectionary Text of the Greek New Testament."

DONALD E. CRANNELL (B.D. '57) was appointed president for 1959 of the Delavan Council of Churches, Delavan, Illinois. Mr. Crannell is minister of the First Presbyterian Church in Delavan.

C. RAY DOBBINS (M.A. '51) has been elected delegate from the Cumberland Presbyterian Church to the World Presbyterian Alliance, São Paulo, Brazil, July 27–August 7, 1959. He will also visit Cumberland Presbyterian missions, churches, and schools in Colombia, South America.

J. WINFIELD FRETZ (Ph.D. '41) was awarded a Guggenheim Fellowship to do a year's study on the sociology of colonization in Paraguay, 1958–59. Mr. Fretz is chairman of the Department of Social Sciences and professor of sociology at Bethal College, North Newton, Kansas.

JOHN N. GREGG (B.D. '59) was ordained to the ministry by the Presbytery of Logansport at the First Presbyterian Church, Michigan City, Indiana, on June 23, 1959. On June 28 he was installed as minister of the Marlboro Presbyterian Church by the Presbytery of Chicago.

ROBERT S. HOAGLAND ('28–'30) has accepted a call to the pastorate of the Unitarian Church of Park Forest, Illinois. He was formerly the pastor of the Unitarian Church of Tacoma, Washington.

DON W. HOLTER (Ph.D. '34) was inaugurated president of the National

Methodist Theological Seminary, Kansas City, Missouri, on April 17, 1959. The inaugural address was given by Dr. Henry P. Van Dusen, president of Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

Berkeley D. Pugh (M.A. '51) was appointed in March, 1959, by the government of India as tribal welfare officer for the state of Assam. Mr. Pugh writes: "The 'tribals' are aboriginal peoples—about two million of them inhabiting this State—who have a culture all their own." Before his appointment he had served five years as youth worker and executive secretary of the Assam Christian Council.

Ewell J. Reagin (B.D. '57) has been appointed associate director of the Cornell University United Religious Work, Ithaca, New York. Mr. Reagin was formerly the Assistant to the Dean of Rockefeller Memorial Chapel at the University of Chicago.

Robert P. Roth (Ph. D. '47) had an honorary Doctor of Divinity degree conferred upon him by Roanoke College, Salem, Virginia. The degree was bestowed at the annual commencement exercises held at the college on May 31, where Dr. Roth also delivered the baccalaureate address to the graduating class.

Peder Stiansen (M.A. '29), teacher, pastor, editor, and author, still lives in the same faculty apartment at Northern Baptist Theological Seminary into which he and Mrs. Stiansen moved in 1926. Dr. Stiansen headed Northern's Department of Church History for thirty years. For fifteen years prior to retirement in 1957 he served as dean of the school and for many more years was dean of the Norwegian Seminary. Author of several outstanding books, Dr. Stiansen also edited the *Missionary,* served three terms on the board of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society, and led the Norwegian Conference. He is still busy with pulpit supply, research, and writing.

Douglas Sturm (B.D. '53), and his wife, Margie Jean (M.A. '57), have accepted a post at Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pennsylvania, where Mr. Sturm has been appointed assistant professor in the Department of Religion.

Irene Teagarden ('30–'31) retired on July 1, 1959, as chairman of the Euthenics Department, Beirut College for Women, Beirut, Lebanon. She will return to her home in New York City.

Morgan L. Williams (B.D. '17), pastor of Parkside Baptist Church, Chicago, since 1949, has resigned as of June 1. During the ten years Mr. Williams has served the Parkside Church he has exerted a gracious but positive leadership. Under his guidance the church came to recognize its responsibility to the changing community and is now integrated.

In Memoriam

Egbert LeRoy Dakin (B.D. '11), minister of fellowship of the Church by the Sea, Madeira Beach, Florida, died at Suncoast Hospital, after participating in the Sunday services as usual in the morning, April 12. Dr. Dakin, a Ca-

nadian by birth (born June 5, 1879), was graduated from Acadia University and the University of Chicago. He was awarded the Doctor of Divinity degree by Acadia University in 1926.

He has served important pastorates in Canada and the United States, among them the Baptist Temple in Logansport, Indiana; the Memorial Church in Chicago; the Temple in Charleston, West Virginia; the Brooklyn, New York, Temple; and the First Baptist Church in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. He was elected pastor emeritus of the latter church and held that post at the time of his death.

Among the many offices he held were the presidency of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the presidency of the Milwaukee Council of Churches, membership of the executive board of the Federal Council of Churches, the presidency of the Milwaukee Kiwanis Club, and the presidency of the Milwaukee Chapter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Dr. Dakin was also associated with international groups as director of the World University Round Table, The World Fellowship of Faiths, and also the American Director of the Pax Christi Movement. From 1945 until 1953 he was field representative for CARE, and then for two years was executive director of the Western New York Chapter of the Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation.

For the last three years he has been a member of the staff of the Church by the Sea as minister of ecumenical fellowship and much beloved by all who knew him.

The living members of his family are his wife, Iva Winnifred; three sons, Barton Dakin, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Russell J. Dakin, Havana, Illinois; and Eugene Dakin, Buffalo, New York; one daughter, Mrs. O. S. Sample, Fort Pierce, Florida; two brothers, Boyd Dakin, Berwick, Nova Scotia, and Guy A. Dakin, Grenfell, Saskatchewan; and six grandchildren and three great-grandchildren.

Robert Van Meigs (B.D. '98), former minister of Logan Square Baptist Church, Chicago, died on April 4 at Chestertown, Maryland, at the age of eighty-six. He was pastor of the church from 1929 to 1940 and was named pastor emeritus three years ago. The church plans to remodel one of the church rooms in honor of Dr. and Mrs. Van Meigs. The Reverend Mr. Van Meigs was also pastor emeritus of the First Baptist Church of Arthur, Illinois, where he served many years ago. A gift memorial is being sent to Bacone College, from which institution he was graduated in 1894, by the Arthur church.

Mr. Van Meigs will be remembered by many American Baptists as the delegate who offered the Harmony Resolution to the 1925 Baptist Convention in Seattle, which prevented a division in Northern Baptist ranks.

CHANGE OF ALUMNI INFORMATION!

The Divinity School, in order to keep alumni information up to date, will print this Change of Information Form on the back cover of each issue of the *Divinity School News*. The form is for your convenience. Please use it when you have a change of address or a new position or if you have an interesting project under way. We need your co-operation in receiving this information promptly.

Date_____

Name _____

Year(s) in attendance at the Divinity School_____

Preferred Mailing
Address_____

I have Change of Information concerning:

☐ Address ☐ Position ☐ Other News

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please return this form to THE DIVINITY SCHOOL. THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, Chicago 37, Illinois.

[PRINTED IN U.S.A.]